UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/360,399	07/23/1999	PERRY A. CARO	07844/303001	4121

21876 7590 04/08/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. Box 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1022

EXAMINER	
HUYNH, CONG LAC T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/360,399	CARO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cong-Lac Huynh	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 December 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-49 and 51-55* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-49 and 51-55* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 12/6/04 to the application filed on 7/23/99.

2. Claims 1-49, 51-55 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 3, 12, 19-21, 27, 34, 40, 45, 50, 51, 53-55 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 19, 55 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Liu et al. (US Pat No. 6,424,978 B1, 7/23/02, filed 12/5/97).

Regarding independent claim 1, Liu discloses:

- enabling storage of a binding specification that describes a document by associating individual content elements with individual layout elements (figure 2, abstract, col 2, lines 12-25, 47-57: the fact that the mixer provides the description for *attaching the format commands of style to the document contents* indicates

that said description, which is equivalent to the binding specification, is stored in the mixer)

- the layout elements defining layout features or placement information to be applied to the associated content elements in the document when the content and the layout elements are combined according to at least one binding included in the binding specification to generate the document based on the binding specification, the content elements, and the layout elements (figure 2, col 3, lines 3-15: attaching the layout to the content for generating a document where the layout is for providing the format for the contents in a document according to the descriptions; col 2, lines 12-25: since based on the descriptions in the mixer as an input in conjunction with the content and the layout, the formatting scripts are generated and executed to generate hypermedia documents, generating such documents is performed based on the layout, the content, and the descriptions, which is equivalent to the binding specification)
- the binding specification being stored separately from both the content and layout elements (figure 2: the fact that the style and the content are not included in the mixer indicates that the description of attaching style and content of document objects, which is equivalent to the binding specification, are stored separately from both the style elements and the content elements)

Claim 19 is for a machine-readable program of method claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 55, Liu discloses:

- enabling storage of a binding specification that describes a document by associating individual content elements with individual layout elements (figure 2, abstract, col 2, lines 12-25, 47-57: the fact that the mixer provides the description of attaching the format commands of style to the document content indicates that the description of attaching is stored in the mixer)
- the layout elements defining layout features or placement information to be applied to the associated content elements in the document, the document being generated based on the binding specification, the content elements, and the layout elements (figure 2, col 3, lines 3-15: attaching the layout to the content for generating a document where the layout is for providing the format for the contents in a document according to the descriptions; col 2, lines 12-25: since based on the descriptions in the mixer as an input in conjunction with the content and the layout, the formatting scripts are generated and executed to generate hypermedia documents, generating such documents is performed based on the layout, the content, and the descriptions, which is equivalent to the binding specification)
- the binding specification being stored separately from both the content and layout elements (figure 2: the fact that the style and the content are not included in the mixer indicates that the description of attaching style and content of document objects, which is equivalent to the binding specification, are stored separately from both the style elements and the content elements)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 2-11, 20, 45-49 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. (US Pat No. 6,424,978 B1, 7/23/02, filed 12/5/97).

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Liu does not explicitly disclose that at least one other binding is included in a different binding specification that describes another, different document by associating at least one of the content elements with at least one of the layout elements, at least one layout elements defining layout features or

placement information to be applied to at least one corresponding content element in the different document.

However, Liu does teach that the binding specification for the different document being stored separately from the binding specification for the document and separately from the content and layout elements (figure 2 and col 3, lines 3-15, 33-44: the layout and the content are inputted into the mixer for producing a hypermedia document based on the format object descriptions; this shows that the style and the content are separate from each other and also separate from the mixer where to store the attaching description of layout and content and where to produce different combinations of layouts and contents).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Liu to incorporate the features of including different bindings in different binding specifications that describe different ways of associating content elements and layout elements for the following reason. The fact that the mixer provides the descriptions of attaching style and content where there are different style elements and content elements inputted in suggests that there be different descriptions of attaching layout and content to produce different documents by combining different style elements and content elements.

Independent claim 3 includes limitations of claims 1 and 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1 or 3, Liu discloses that at least one binding provides a primary control for the generation of the document and the different document (abstract, col 2, lines 12-25, 47-65: at least one script generated from the description is used to control the procedure of attaching formatting commands to multimedia information to generate a document).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 2 or 3, Liu discloses enabling generation of the document and the different document using the elements and the at least one binding in the binding specification (abstract, col 2, lines 12-25, 47-65: as mentioned in claim 4, a document is generated based on the script generated from one of the descriptions of attaching the contents and layout elements).

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1 or 3, Liu discloses enabling storage of the content elements and the layout elements (col 2, lines 13-25, 47-65, col 3, lines 3-31: the fact that the layout and content are the inputs to the mixer for generating a hypermedia document inherently shows that the layout data and the content data are stored in the system so that the layout data and the content data can be retrieved to be inputted into the mixer).

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1 or 3, Liu discloses that at least some of the layout elements and at least some of the content elements are identified by uniquely named binding sites (col 2, lines 12-25, 47-65: the fact that style and content

are inputted into mixer/formatter for producing a hypermedia document inherently shows that the style element and content element must have a unique name to identify them).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1 or 3, Liu does not explicitly disclose that the content elements are stored in a portfolio and the layout elements are stored in a separate portfolio.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Liu to include the layout portfolio and the content portfolio for storing layout elements and content elements for the following reason. As mentioned in claim 6, the layout elements and the content elements are stored in the system. Also, the layout elements and the content elements are the separate inputs to the mixer (figure 2). Therefore, it is suggested that the layout elements and the content elements be stored separately in different directories in the memory where the different directories, equivalent different portfolios, are for containing different types of data such as layout data or content data.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1 or 3, Liu discloses that the binding specification includes a plurality of bindings and in which some of the bindings are layout-centric and some of the bindings are content-centric (col 2, lines 13-25, 47-65, col 7, lines 27-31: the mixer receiving document style and document content and providing card-based object descriptions *encapsulating different types of procedural*

formatting directives for the card-based hypermedia documents shows that the descriptions include a plurality of formats for a document based on the received document style and the received document content; *it is also obvious that it is possible to attach different formatting commands to a same content or to attach a same formatting command to different contents where attaching formatting commands and contents in such ways are content-centric and layout-centric*).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 2 or 3, Liu does not explicitly disclose that the binding specification for the two documents are the same and at least one of the content elements and layout elements associated with the binding sites is different for the document and the different document.

Instead, Liu discloses attaching formatting commands to document contents through a pre-processing procedure based on the formatting descriptions and the inputted layout and content (col 2, lines 12-25, 47-65, figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Liu to include said missing limitations for the following reason. It is true that the two documents are different if they have different names. Therefore, it was obvious that only one layout element or one content element of each of the documents that has a different name would make the two documents different though the bindings of the two documents are the same.

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 2 or 3, Liu does not explicitly disclose that the binding specification for the two documents are different and at least some of the content elements and layout elements associated with the binding sites are the same for the document and the different document.

Instead, Liu discloses attaching formatting commands to document contents through a pre-processing procedure based on the formatting descriptions and the inputted layout and content (col 2, lines 12-25, 47-65, figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Liu to include the missing features since it is a common sense that the different bindings of the two documents would provide the different arrangements for the two documents that make them to be different even though some of the content elements and the layout elements of the two documents are the same.

Claim 20 is for a machine-readable program of method claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 45, Liu discloses:

- generating documents based on the binding specification, a layout and the content (col 2, lines 12-25, 47-57, col 3, lines 3-15, figures 1-2)
- the binding specification including global bindings and direct bindings that aid the formatter in formatting documents based on the binding specification, the content elements, and the layout elements (col 2, lines 12-25, 47-57, figures 1 and 2:

direct formatting is for direct bindings and script-based formatting is for global bindings where the mixer has the description of attaching style and content together for formatting documents; since based on the descriptions in the mixer as an input in conjunction with the content and the layout, the formatting scripts are generated and executed to generate hypermedia documents, generating or formatting such documents is performed based on the layout, the content, and the descriptions, which is equivalent to the binding specification)

- the binding specification stored separated from both the content and the layout (figure 2: the fact that the style and the content are not included in the mixer indicates that the style elements, the content elements, and the description of attaching style and content of document objects are stored separately)

Liu does not explicitly disclose the content portfolio and the layout portfolio for storing content and layout. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Liu to incorporate the content portfolio and the layout portfolio for the following reason. The fact that the layout and the content are inputted in the mixer for creating a document suggests that the layout and the content data be stored in the system in different directories for differentiating the data of different types. This also suggests that different directories for storing layouts and for storing contents are equivalent to the content portfolio and the layout portfolio.

Regarding claim 46, which is dependent on claim 45, Liu discloses that the global bindings includes a list of elements bindings that define a default binding for elements of

a specified type (col 3, lines 3-31: the formatting description is for controlling the procedure of generating card-based hypermedia document file format by generating formatting scripts where some of the descriptions can be selected as a default binding).

Regarding claim 47, which is dependent on claim 45, Liu does not explicitly disclose that the global bindings include a list of model bindings that define a default model for a specified binding site. Instead, Liu discloses the format descriptions used to generate scripts for controlling the attaching of the layout and the content (col 3, lines 3-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated in Liu a default model for a specified binding site since from a plurality of format descriptions, one of said descriptions can be selected to set as a default model for faster generating a document based on the default set up instead of spending time for selecting layout elements and content elements for each document.

Regarding claim 48, which is dependent on claim 45, Liu discloses that the binding specification contains composition sequences that aid the formatter in formatting documents, the composition sequences defining the order in which formatting is to proceed using binding between content elements and layout elements, each of the composition sequences including composition blocks containing ordered list of direct bindings (col 3, lines 17-54: the Hypermedia Card Format takes the formatting object descriptions as an input and generates a sequences of card-based formatting script

descriptions as an output where said sequences are the order of how to format a hypermedia file).

Regarding claim 49, which is dependent on claim 45, Liu discloses that each of the direct bindings comprises a placement binding or a style binding (figure 1, col 2, lines 47-57: direct formatting generates the formats that can be used directly by the authoring tools where style and content inputted to mixer providing a direct output to a known file format).

8. Claims 12-18, 21-44, 51-54 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel et al. (US Pat No. 6,199,082 B1, 3/6/01, filed 7/17/95).

Regarding independent claim 12, Ferrel discloses:

- creating individual content elements for use in documents (figure 1, #112, #114, #118; col 5, lines 29-41: "... the author can create the content objects"; col 11, lines 14-20: "returning to the creation of title layouts and content by the publisher; it is obvious that the content objects are individual content objects)
- storing the individual content elements in a format native to the application program (col 8, lines 15-20; col 11, lines 14-20, 45-62: "after creation, the title layouts 110, 116 and contents 112, 114, 118 are released and *stored in a publication storage 120. The storage 120 can be implemented in many forms, such as a network 122, CD-ROM 124, and other means of storage, such as*

bulletin boards, magnetic media, cable television and so forth", "the title layouts *and/or content are preferably stored in a network 122 that includes a high-performance server for hosting on-line application*"; the fact that the contents are stored in the network 122 that includes a high-performance server for hosting on-line application suggests that the format of the contents when storing is *native* in the on-line application so that the stored contents can be understandable by the application)

- forming a content portfolio, based on the stored content elements by storing unique binding names associated with respective content elements and the layout portfolio storing individual layout elements (figure 4: content folders #292, #296, #298, #304, #308 for storing content elements, title folders #294, #300, #306 for storing layouts; the fact that each project has *content folders and title folders that include content and layout* for generating different documents suggest that each content element have an unique name for conveniently calling the content elements in associating with the layout elements)
- the binding specification for generating hypermedia documents based on the individual page layouts and the individual content (figure 1, col 10, lines 31-63: using the stored content, the stored layout in each title such as title A .. title P where a title is to *describe the overall plan or instructions for assembling the complete on-line multimedia* publishing, where the instructions or the overall plan for assembling a multimedia document is equivalent to a binding specification)

Ferrel does not explicitly disclose storing information with each of the contents that aids a formatter in generating document based on a binding specification, the individual content elements and individual on layout elements stored in a layout portfolio. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Ferrel to include storing information with each of the contents that aids a formatter in generating document based on a binding specification, the individual content elements and on individual layout elements stored in a layout portfolio for the following reason. Ferrel does teach the binding specification for generating documents based on the individual page layouts and the individual content (figure 1, col 10, lines 31-63: using the stored content, the stored layout in each title such as title A .. title P where a title is to describe *the instructions for assembling the complete on-line multimedia* publishing, where the instructions for assembling a multimedia document is equivalent to a binding specification). Since it was well known in the art that storing must be performed whenever generating a document, storing information with each of the contents that aids a formatter in generating documents would have been obvious to be combined to Ferrel to keep generated data for later use.

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, Ferrel discloses that the information that aides the formatter comprises attributes associated with the content elements (col 8, lines 30-48: "... the designer creates projects with design and content *information* ...within each section are pages that define the information that is displayed to a single screen", the information is considered as attributes associated with the

content for linking the content and the layout of a document; col 18, lines 31-45: the *information needed to build* and distribute *one or more title and any associated content* included in the project C shows the claimed attributes since this information is for building the title and the associated content).

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, Ferrel discloses that storing binding specification which refers to the content elements (figure 1: title A, title B, ...title P are binding specifications which refer to content 148, content 152, content 156; col 10, lines 31-63: using the stored content, the stored layout in each title such as title A .. title P where a title is to describe *the instructions for assembling the complete on-line multimedia* publishing, where the instructions for assembling a multimedia document is equivalent to a binding specification).

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 12, Ferrel discloses that forming of the content portfolio also comprises storing implementation specific properties (col 28, lines 49-57: the project object represents the entire contents of the project and has *properties* representing where the project's content are released to; col 18, line 53 to col 19, line 17: the Properties option from the menu for editing the content objects implies that the properties of content objects are stored, and the creation of content projects inherently shows forming a content portfolio based on the created content objects).

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 12, Ferrel discloses that forming of the content portfolio also comprises storing portfolio-specific attributes (col 32, lines 37-61: the content folder which is considered as a content portfolio comprises two types of content objects Stories and Pictures with specific attributes).

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 12, Ferrel discloses that forming of the content portfolio also comprises storing a list of binding sites of elements belonging to the content portfolio (col 32, lines 37-61: the fact that the content folders are containers for titles and for story objects implies that the container contain a list of the names of these objects).

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 12, Ferrel discloses that forming of the content portfolio also comprises storing a list of groups of content elements belonging to the content portfolio (col 32, lines 37-61: the fact that the content folder comprises two types of content objects Stories and Pictures implies that the content folder comprise a list of two groups of content elements belonging to the content portfolio and stored in the memory).

Claims 21-26 are for a medium for storing a machine-readable program of method claims 12-13, 15-18, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 27 includes the same limitations as in independent claim 12 but for layout elements instead of content elements. Ferrel discloses that the layouts and contents for generating documents are stored separately where the layouts are stored in title folders (col 10, line 3 to col 11, line 20; figure 4; col 15, line 44 to col 16, line 13). This inherently shows that Ferrel include the same features of layout elements needed for generating documents as disclosed for content element case.

Claims 28-33 include the same limitations as in claims 13-18 but for layout elements instead of content elements, and are rejected under the same rationale and under the same argument as mentioned in claim 27.

Claims 34-39 are for a medium of method claims 27-33, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 40, Ferrel discloses creating a binding specification for use in formatting documents based on the binding specification, the content elements referenced by the binding specification and the layout elements referenced by the binding specification (figure 1, col 10, lines 31-63: title A, title B, ... title P include the specific layout and the specific content for formatting different documents for different customers, using the stored content, the stored layout in each title such as title A .. title P where a title is to describe *the instructions for assembling the complete on-line*

multimedia publishing, where the instructions for assembling a multimedia document is equivalent to a binding specification).

Ferrel does not does not explicitly disclose storing in the binding specification global bindings and direct bindings that aid the formatter in formatting documents.

Instead Ferrel discloses that the publisher can place the content, such as *a set of content objects in one or more containers of a title* and then create sections or subsections having pages with special controls, such as a set of title layout objects that dynamically find and display the content at run-time (col 10, lines 31-67). The style sheet object included in the layout has a *globally unique identifier GUID* that can be used to identify an object with a unique string of characters where the control for controlling the link between the layout and the content of a document keeps a record of a GUID associated with its linked style sheet (col 23, lines 48-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Ferrel to incorporate storing the global bindings and the direct bindings in the binding specification into Ferrel for the following reason.

It was well known in the art that storing must be performed whenever data is generated. Therefore, storing global bindings and direct binding would have been obvious to be combined to Ferrel to identify each style sheet with the content as well as controlling the link between the layout and the content of a document based on the placement indicating how to link a content to a layout.

Regarding claim 41, which is dependent on claim 40, Ferrel does not disclose explicitly that the global bindings include a list of element bindings that define a default binding for elements of a specified type. However, Ferrel does teach that the style sheet objects are stored in the cache object store COS under the GUID as mentioned in claim 40 (col 23, lines 25-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Ferrel to include a list of element bindings that define a default binding for elements of a specified type since storing of style objects by object identifiers suggests a list of default element bindings for a specified type of style sheet.

Regarding claim 42, which is dependent on claim 41, Ferrel discloses that the global bindings include a list of model bindings that define a default model for a specified binding site (figure 4 and col 15, line 44 to col 16, line 13: the container of publishers which contain a plurality of publishers including projects which are predefined binding of title folders and content folders is considered as a list of model bindings that define a default model for a specified binding site).

Regarding claim 43, which is dependent on claim 40, Ferrel discloses that the binding specification contains composition sequences that aid the formatter in formatting documents, the composition sequences defining the order in which formatting is to proceed using bindings between content elements and layout elements, each of the composition sequences including composition blocks containing ordered lists of direct

bindings (**col 8, lines 30-38**: the design and content information in each project is considered as composition sequences since said information is the sequences of text data; **col 10, lines 31-67**: the publisher can place the content, such as a set of content objects in one or more containers of a title and then *create sections or subsections having pages with special controls, such as a set of title layout objects* that dynamically find and display the content at run-time). The *sections and subsections* with special controls indicates that the *component blocks of ordered list* of controls are considered to by equivalent to direct bindings since sections and subsections are ordered blocks of data.

Regarding claim 44, which is dependent on claim 43, Ferrel discloses that each of the direct bindings comprises a placement binding or a style binding (col 8, lines 39-64:the content has been formatted within the pre-defined control region of the page, the control knows how to format a particular piece of content by looking at the style that has been defined by the designer and then compares that style to a linked style sheet).

Regarding independent claim 51, Ferrel discloses a method of formatting a document using stored content elements, stored layout elements, and *a binding specification*, the stored content elements including content aspects and layout aspect, the method comprising determining whether the layout should be dominated by the layout components or the layout aspects of the content components (**figure 1, col 10, lines 31-63**: using the stored content, the stored layout in each title such as title A .. title P

where a title is to describe *the instructions for assembling the complete on-line multimedia* publishing, where the instructions for assembling a multimedia document is equivalent to a binding specification; **col 8, lines 15-29**: "the content and the design are stored as separate objects in the public distribution site so that *many different pieces of content* can *be viewed with the same appearance*; **col 10, lines 37-63**: a layout can be used for binding with a content where the content can be updated; col 8, lines 49-64: "one important facet of this invention is the concept of viewing the same content objects in many different ways ...different controls on the same page can each displays the same linked content in varying formats"; **col 8, line 65 to col 9, line 7**:*a content* can be displayed by *different styles* chosen by the designer to change the style; the fact that some of the bindings are **layout-centric** and some of the bindings are **content-centric** indicates determining the layout domination or the content domination in formatting a document using stored content elements and stored layout elements).

Regarding claim 52, which is dependent on claim 51, Ferrel discloses that the content elements include layout aspects and the bindings contain information sufficient to mediate a conflict between a layout aspect of a content element and a layout element with which the content element is associated (col 8, lines 15-64: the fact that the control knows how to format a particular piece of content by *looking at the style defined* and then *comparing* that style to a linked style sheet inherently shows a mediation of conflict between the layout aspect of the content and a layout element with which the content element is associated).

Claims 53 and 54 are for a medium of method claims 12 and 45, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 12/6/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants amend the claims by emphasizing that generating a document is based on the binding specification, the content elements, and the layout elements, which are the three inputs, as Applicants pointed out in the interview on November 16, 2004, rather than the two inputs, layout and content, in Liu.

However, in reconsideration, the Examiner realizes that in Liu, the document generating is actually based on the layout, the content, and the descriptions of attaching the format and the content stored in the mixer. Based on the descriptions in the mixer as an input in conjunction with the content and the layout, the formatting scripts are generated and executed to generate hypermedia documents (col 2, lines 12-25, figure 2).

The claim rejections, therefore, remain.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Freishtat et al. (US Pat No. 6,567,850 B1, 5/20/03, filed 10/27/99, priority 10/28/98).

Balsara et al. (US Pat No. 6,065,012, 5/16/00, filed 2/27/98).

Kiyono et al. (US Pat No. 6,137,483, 10/24/00, filed 11/27/96).

Facq et al. (US Pat No. 6,016,520, 1/18/00, filed 7/14/95).

Nichols, Softscape Introduces Softscape Explorer Plus, Business Wire, May 20, 1996, pg.1, 6 pgs.

Borchers et al., Getting It Across Layout Issues for Kiosk Systems, SIGCHI Bulletin October 1995, pages 68-74.

Wiecha et al., Separating Content from Form : A Language for Formatting On-Line Documentation and Dialog, ACM 1986, pages 1-7.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Clh
3/30/05

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER